arXiv:1209.2110v1 [gr-qc] 9 Sep 2012

Kick-off Note on Possible Emergence Time of Newton Gravity

Lajos Diósi*
Wigner Research Center for Physics
H-1525 Budapest 114, POB 49, Hungary
(Dated: September 12, 2012)

If gravity were an emergent phenomenon, some relativistic as well as non-relativistic speculations claim it is, then a certain emergence time scale $\tau_?$ would characterize it. We argue that both astronomic and laboratory evidences have poor time resolution regarding how immediate the creation of Newton field of accelerating mass sources is. The current upper limit on $\tau_?$ is perhaps not stronger than 1s. Although the concrete theoretical model of gravity's 'laziness' is missing, the concept might be tested directly in reachable experiments.

PACS numbers:

Physicists have always been speculating that gravity may emerge from a structure of deeper level. Gravity has been resisting to relativistic quantum field theories despite their robust success all over the past fifty-sixty years. If gravity itself is not a relativistic quantized field, it might be induced by them. According to Sakharov [1], the Casimir energy of quantized matter fields yields elastic forces on the background space-time, resulting in similar dynamics to Einstein's general relativity. This approach, its variants and refinements (cf., e.g., [2, 3]) represent the main stream of 'emergent gravity' investigations. Alternative concepts [4–6] relate Einstein's theory to thermodynamics and derive the gravitational force from the entropy. Other speculations postpone the relativistic aspects, abandon quantum field theory, but assume an intrinsic relationship between Newtonian (i.e., non-relativistic) gravity and quantum mechanics [7–12]. Some advocate phenomenological mechanisms for the emergence of the Newton interaction [10, 13].

Our note restricts itself for emergence of the Newtonian, non-relativistic gravity. If this emergence is real at all, it must be characterized by a certain *emergence time* $\tau_?$ and the value of $\tau_?$ is expected to be longer than the typical time-scales of relativistic emergence. It could depend on the wave length but we further simplify our assumption as to look for a single time scale $\tau_?$. We mean that the gravitational field of an accelerating mass source shall not immediately follow the Newton law but with a delay of about $\tau_?$. We test the possible value of $\tau_?$ against the most common evidences and we do it prior to any consistent concrete non-relativistic model of gravity with non-zero emergence time $\tau_?$.

A straightforward evidence is the astronomic one. For centuries, the solar planetary system has been known to satisfy Newton's theory with extreme precision. The Einstein theory of gravitation predicts relativistic corrections but these are usually too small to become detectable. The notable exception is the predicted perihelion motion $\delta\varphi = 43''$ of the Mercury, which was experimentally confirmed several times (for details see, e.g.: [14] and references therein). We are going to perform a vague and preliminary guess of $\tau_?$, based on the fact of detectability of this $43''$. The Einstein theory expresses it as $\delta\varphi = 6\pi(GM/pc^2)$ where M is the solar mass, p is the semi-lactus rectum of Mercury's orbit, c is the speed of light. By introducing the average relativistic *propagation time* $\tau_c = p/c$, we express $\delta\varphi$ via τ_c instead of c:

$$\delta\varphi = 6\pi\frac{GM}{p^3}\tau_c^2 = 43 \times 2\pi/60^4. \tag{1}$$

The interpretation of τ_c is this: any perturbation of the Sun's motion will influence the mercurian orbit at a time delayed by τ_c on average, i.e., the propagation time τ_c plays the formal role of the effective emergence time for Newton gravity in the Sun-Mercury system. There is a difference between the two concepts, however. Our emergence time $\tau_?$ does not depend on the distance from the mass source, the relativistic propagation time τ_c does.

How would the perihelion motion depend on the suggested emergence time $\tau_?$, we don't yet know because we have not constructed the concrete model. The expression may be the same as (1), with τ_c replaced by $\tau_?$. If so, we may conclude that the emergence time $\tau_?$ cannot be much longer than the relativistic propagation time $\tau_c \approx 3min$ since with the opposite choice $\tau_? \gg \tau_c$ the value of $\delta\varphi$ would be significantly greater than $43''$. Accordingly, we may claim the conservative upper limit

$$\tau_? \ll \tau_c \sim 1min \tag{2}$$

for the emergence time $\tau_?$. Recall that we assumed that $\delta\varphi \sim (GM/p^3)\tau_?^2$, similarly to (1). What happens if the lowest order contribution of $\tau_?$ to $\delta\varphi$ differs from the lowest (i.e.: second) order contribution of τ_c in the Einstein theory? If $\delta\varphi \sim (GM/p^3)^{n/2}\tau_?^n$, the upper limit (2) should be replaced by $\varphi^{(1/n)-(1/2)}\tau_c$. For $n = 1$ we should take

$$\tau_? \ll \sqrt{\varphi}\tau_c \sim 1sec\ . \tag{3}$$

The values $n > 2$ loosen the limit toward irrelevant high values as, e.g., 1h in case of $n = 4$.

Although our proposal is purposely non-relativistic, its relationship to the Einstein theory must be stated. We mean to attribute a certain laziness to gravity, which may not invalidate the Einstein theory for the large scale dynamics of space-time. Our proposal forbids gravitational waves of periods shorter than cca. $\tau_?$, but it does not forbid periods much longer than $\tau_?$. Now, the only available experimental (indirect) evidence of gravitational waves confirms the radiation of the Hulse-Taylor binary pulsar at period 7.75h [17], much-much larger than our conservative guess (2) of $\tau_?$. Further relativistic predictions of the Einstein theory are light deflection, lensing and delay in the presence of gravity: these effects have been confirmed (cf. [14]) in the gravitational field of static or slowly moving sources of irrelevant acceleration to confront the above guess of $\tau_?$.

Another straightforward class of evidences is accomplished laboratory experiments on Newton theory. In a standard Cavendish experiment [15], a torsion balance measures the gravitational attraction produced by static source masses. Because of static sources, time-resolution is beyond the scope of the standard Cavendish experiments. Fortunately, there are Cavendish experiments with moving sources. In the Gundlach-Merkowitz experiment the sources are revolving and a time-resolution below $1min$ seems available [16]. The re-analysis of the experimental data would put an upper limit on $\tau_?$, stronger than (2).

We ought to discuss the theoretical implications of a nonzero emergence time. Unfortunately, the naive generalization of the Newton law in order to capture a finite emergence time won't be consistent. Perhaps no Galilean invariant many-body model is able to capture a finite emergence time. Nevertheless, we know that standard field theories capture finite *propagation times* hence we tolerate the theoretical obstacles of finite *emergence times*. They might be relaxed in the framework of a future theory where certain 'fields' —dynamical and/or statistical—assist to massive bodies.

The peaceful coexistence of our proposal with large scale general relativity, i.e., the apparent consistency of the proposal with current experimental evidences would soon become challenged. As we mentioned, a Cavendish type experiment with moving mass sources can heavily reduce the proposed upper limit of gravity's laziness. A precise measurement can be done at the gravity wave detectors [18], too. While they cannot resolve the gravity wave propagation time from a moving nearby source (e.g.: a spinning dumbbell), they would perfectly resolve the emergence time in (and much below) the range of 1s. Even if the theoretical background of a possible emergence time is vague at the moment, reachable experiments should answer if $\tau_?$ can be that big. They would easily push the upper limit on $\tau_?$ toward zero. (Or, they might in principle find new physics with $0 < \tau_? \ll 1min$!)

Support by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund under Grant No. 75129 and support by the EU COST Action MP100 are acknowledged. The author thanks Tamás Geszti and Péter Király for interesting discussions.

---

* Electronic address: diosi.lajos@wigner.mta.hu; URL: `www.rmki.kfki.hu/~diosi`

[1] A.D. Sakharov, Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR **177**, 70 (1967); Gen. Rel. Grav. **32** 365 (2000).

[2] S.L. Adler, Rev. Mod. Phys. **54**, 729 (1982).

[3] M. Visser, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **17** 977 (2002).

[4] T. Jacobson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1260 (1995).

[5] E. P. Verlinde, JHEP **04**, 029 (2011).

[6] T. Padmanabhan, Rep. Prog. Phys. **73** 6901 (2010).

[7] L. Diósi and B. Lukács, Annln. Phys. **44** 488 (1987); L. Diósi, Phys. Lett. **120A** 377 (1987); L.Diósi: *Quantum measurement and gravity for each other*, p299 in: Quantum Chaos - Quantum Measurement, eds.: P.Cvitanovic, I.Percival and A. Wirzba (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1992).

[8] K.R.W. Jones, Aust. J. Phys. **48**, 1055 (1995).

[9] R. Penrose, Gen. Rel. Grav. **28**, 581 (1996);

[10] S. De Filippo and F. Maimone, Phys. Rev. D **66** 044018 (2002); F. Maimone, G. Scelza, A. Naddeo and V. Pelino, Phys. Rev A **83** 062124 (2011).

[11] T. Geszti, Phys. Rev. **A69**, 032110 (2004).

[12] J. Van Wezel, T. Oosterkamp, J. Zaanen, Phil. Mag. **88** 1005 (2008); J. Van Wezel and J. Van der Brink, Phil. Mag. **88** 1659 (2008).

[13] L. Diósi and T.N. Papp, Phys. Lett. **373A** 3244 (2009); L. Diósi, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **174** 012002 (2009).

[14] I. Ciufuloni and J.A. Wheeler: *Gravitation and Inertia* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1995).

[15] G.G. Luther and G.R. Towler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 121 (1982).

[16] J.H. Gundlach and S.M. Merkowitz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2869 (2000).

[17] R. V. Wagoner, Astrophys. J. Lett. **196**, L63 (1975).

[18] B.P. Abbott, et al. (LIGO Scientific Collaboration), Rep. Prog. Phys. **72**, 076901 (2009); T. Accadia et al. (VIRGO Scientific Collaboration), J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. **203**, 012074 (2010).